UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN SOUTHERN DIVISION

FORD MOTOR COMPANY.

Defendants.

Plaintiff,	Case No. 15-cv-10628 (consolidated with Case No. 15-11624)
v.	Hon. Matthew F. Leitman
VERSATA SOFTWARE, INC. et al.	

ORDER (1) SUSTAINING IN PART AND OVERRULING IN PART
VERSATA'S OBJECTIONS TO REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION
OF THE SPECIAL MASTER TO DENY VERSATA'S MOTION TO COMPEL
ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REVIEWS (ECF #298) AND (2) ADOPTING IN
PART THE REPORT AND RECOMMENATION (ECF #297) AS THE ORDER
OF THE COURT

In this action, Versata Software Inc. and other related Defendants (collectively, "Versata") allege that Ford Motor Company infringed certain patents and misappropriated certain trade secrets. During discovery, Versata asked Ford to produce annual performance reviews for a number of Ford employees. Ford objected to producing the requested documents.

The Court referred the discovery dispute to attorney Lawrence D. Graham. The Court previously entered an order appointing Mr. Graham to serve as a Special Master for resolving discovery disputes (the "Appointment Order"). (See ECF #230.) Pursuant to the protocol established in the Appointment Order, Mr. Graham issued a Report and Recommendation in which he recommended that the Court deny Versata's motion to compel Ford to produce the performance reviews (the "R&R"). (See ECF #297.) Versata

has filed objections to that recommendation (see ECF #298) and Ford has filed a response

(see ECF #303).

On September 6, 2017, the Court held an on-the-record telephonic status conference

with counsel for both Ford and Versata to discuss the R&R and Versata's objections. For

the reasons stated on the record during that status conference, IT IS HEREBY

ORDERED that Versata's objections are **SUSTAINED IN PART AND OVERRULED**

IN PART and the R&R is **ADOPTED IN PART** as follows:

Within fourteen (14) days of this Order, Ford shall produce to Versata the

performance reviews for the employees identified on page two of Versata's letter brief to

Mr. Graham (see ECF #297-1 at Pg. ID 15035), for the years identified on that page. Ford

may redact all information in the performance reviews except for: (1) the employee's

name, (2) the year of the performance review, and (3) any references to cost savings related

to the following programs: ACM, MCA, and PDO-R1.1 For the time being, the Court

postpones consideration of whether Ford must un-redact any references to the program

PDO-R2.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Matthew F. Leitman

MATTHEW F. LEITMAN

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Dated: September 7, 2017

¹ To the extent that the performance reviews refer to cost savings from the PDO-R1 program by using a different name or acronym to describe PDO-R1, Ford shall not

redact those references when producing the performance reviews to Versata.

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing document was served upon the parties and/or counsel of record on September 7, 2017, by electronic means and/or ordinary mail.

s/Holly A. Monda
Case Manager

(810) 341-9764